REMARKS

Claims 1-30 remain in the case for reconsideration. No new subject matter has been added.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 11-14 and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi et al (Patent No. 6,735,641) in view of Williams et al. (Patent No. 5,881,296). Claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 15, 16, 18, 19, 25, 26, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ross et al. (Patent No. 5,909,594) in view of Fox (Patent No. 5,890,134). Claims 7, 10, 17, 20, 27 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ross et al and Fox in view of Williams et al (Patent No. 5,881,296).

These rejections are respectfully traversed. However, the claims have been amended to further clarify the patentable subject matter of the invention. For example, claim 1 now specifies a processor adapted to generate a schedule for coordinating a wireless communication session for wirelessly exchanging data between the processor and a first peripheral device only during a first time window having a designated start time and a designated end time. The schedule as specified in claim 1 also coordinates wireless communications for wirelessly exchanging data between the processor and a second peripheral device only after the end time of the first time window.

Neither Kobayashi or Williams suggest generating a schedule that identifies a first time window that has a designated start time and end time for wirelessly communicating with a first peripheral device as specified in claim 1. First, there is no suggestion of any type of wireless communication scheduling scheme in Kobayashi or Williams. Kobayashi describes a printer management system 1 that sets a schedule for conducting maintenance operations (FIG. 3). Kobayashi does not set a schedule that determines when two different wireless communication devices are going to conduct non-conflicting wireless communications as specified in claim 1. For example, there is no specified wireless communication start time and stop time in Kobayashi for conducting the maintenance operations (Col. 5, lines 32-54).

Williams describes an interrupt service routine (ISR) 180 that is used to change the order of processing tasks in a computer system (col. 5, lines 54-col. 6, lines 34). There is no mechanism in Williams for specifying a time window having a start time and stop time for conducting wireless communications as specified in claim 1.

Because Kobayashi and Williams are not even related to wireless communications, there is no need to specify wireless communication time windows for different peripheral devices as specified in claim 1. For example, the wired packet switched network described in

Williams is a "best effort" system that does not have the capacity to designate communication windows having defined start times and stop times. In other words, a transmitting device in a packet switched device does not know how long it will take for packets to arrive over the packet network. Defining a transmission stop time in Williams would not work since there is no guarantee when packets will complete transmission over the packet network. Conversely, wireless communications between two different peripheral devices need to be coordinated not to overlap in time.

Claim 1 has also been amended to specify wirelessly transmitting a rescheduling frame that dynamically enables the second peripheral device to begin wireless communication before the end of the first time window when the data exchange with the first peripheral device completes before the designated end time for the first time window. This is clearly shown in FIG. 5.

There is no suggestion or motivation in Kobayashi or Williams of dynamically varying a defined wireless communication window specified with a first peripheral device to enable a second peripheral device to begin wireless communications before the end of the previously designed first window wireless communication period as specified in claim 1. Kobayashi and Williams do not even contemplate varying a previously defined time window exclusively allocated to a first peripheral device to then be overlapped with wireless communications from another peripheral device as specified in claim 1.

Similar limitations have also be added to the other independent claims.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-30 of the application as amended is solicited. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case

Respectfully submitted,
MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Stephen S. Ford
Reg. No. 35,139

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
1030 SW Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97205
503-222-3613
Customer No. 46404